arXiv:1105.2880v1 [math.GN] 14 May 2011

Coupled coincidence point theorems for mixed (G, S)-monotone operators on partially ordered metric spaces and applications

Habib Yazidi

Abstract

In this paper, we introduce the concept of mixed (G, S)-monotone mappings and prove coupled coincidence and coupled common fixed point theorems for such mappings satisfying a nonlinear contraction involving altering distance functions. Presented theorems extend, improve and generalize the very recent results of Harjani, López and Sadarangani [J. Harjani, B. López and K. Sadarangani, Fixed point theorems for mixed monotone operators and applications to integral equations, Nonlinear Analysis (2010), doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.10.047] and other existing results in the literature. Some applications to periodic boundary value problems are also considered.

Key words: Coincidence point, coupled common fixed point, (G, S)-monotone mapping, ordered set.

1 Introduction and preliminaries

Fixed point problems of contractive mappings in metric spaces endowed with a partially order have been studied by many authors (see [1]-[17]). Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [3] introduced the concept of a coupled fixed point and studied the problems of a uniqueness of a coupled fixed point in partially ordered metric spaces and applied their theorems to problems of the existence of solution for a periodic boundary value problem. In [8], Lakshmikantham and Ćirić established some coincidence and common coupled fixed point theorems under nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces. Very recently, Harjani, López and Sadarangani [7] obtained some coupled fixed point theorems for a mixed monotone operator in a complete metric space endowed with a partial order by using altering distance functions. They applied their results to the study of the existence and uniqueness of a nonlinear integral equation.

Now, we briefly recall various basic definitions and facts.

Definition 1.1 *(see Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [3]). Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and $F : X \times X \to X$. Then the map F is said to have mixed monotone property if $F(x, y)$ is monotone non-decreasing in x and is monotone non-increasing in y, that is, for any $x, y \in X$,*

$$x_1 \preceq x_2 \quad \textit{implies} \quad F(x_1, y) \preceq F(x_2, y) \text{ for all } y \in X$$

and

$$y_1 \preceq y_2 \quad \textit{implies} \quad F(x, y_2) \preceq F(x, y_1) \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

The main result obtained by Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [3] is the following.

Theorem 1.1 *(see Bhaskar and Lakshmikantham [3]). Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and suppose there is a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $F : X \times X \to X$ be a mapping having the mixed monotone property on X. Assume that there exists $k \in [0, 1)$ such that*

$$d(F(x, y), F(u, v)) \leq \frac{k}{2}[d(x, u) + d(y, v)] \textit{ for each } u \preceq x \textit{ and } y \preceq v.$$

Suppose either F is continuous or X has the following properties:

(i) if a non-decreasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x_n \preceq x$ for all n,

(ii) if a non-increasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x \preceq x_n$ for all n.

If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that

$$x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0) \textit{ and } F(y_0, x_0) \preceq y_0,$$

then F has a coupled fixed point.

Inspired by Definition 1.1, Lakshmikantham and Ćirić in [8] introduced the concept of a g-mixed monotone mapping.

Definition 1.2 *(see Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [8]). Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set, $F : X \times X \to X$ and $g : X \to X$. Then the map F is said to have mixed g-monotone property if $F(x, y)$ is monotone g-non-decreasing in x and is monotone g-non-increasing in y, that is, for any $x, y \in X$,*

$$gx_1 \preceq gx_2 \quad \textit{implies} \quad F(x_1, y) \preceq F(x_2, y) \text{ for all } y \in X$$

and

$$gy_1 \preceq gy_2 \quad \textit{implies} \quad F(x, y_2) \preceq F(x, y_1) \text{ for all } x \in X.$$

Definition 1.3 *(see Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [8]). Let X be a non-empty set, and let $F : X \times X \to X$, $g : X \to X$ be given mappings. An element $(x, y) \in X \times X$ is called a coupled coincidence point of the mappings F and g if $F(x, y) = gx$ and $F(y, x) = gy$.*

Definition 1.4 *(see Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [8]). Let X be a non-empty set. Then we say that the mappings $F : X \times X \to X$ and $g : X \to X$ are commutative if*

$$g(F(x, y)) = F(gx, gy).$$

The main result of Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [8] is the following.

Theorem 1.2 *(see Lakshmikantham and Ćirić [8]). Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and suppose there is a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Assume there is a function $\phi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ with $\phi(t) < t$ and $\lim_{r \to t^+} \phi(r) < t$ for each $t > 0$ and also suppose $F : X \times X \to X$ and $g : X \to X$ are such that F has the mixed g-monotone property and*

$$d(F(x,y), F(u,v)) \leq \phi\left(\frac{d(gx,gu) + d(gy,gv)}{2}\right)$$

for all $x, y, u, v \in X$ with $gx \preceq gu$ and $gv \preceq gy$. Assume that $F(X \times X) \subseteq g(X)$, g is continuous and commutes with F and also suppose either F is continuous or X has the following properties:

(i) if a non-decreasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x_n \preceq x$ for all n,

(ii) if a non-increasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x \preceq x_n$ for all n.

If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $gx_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $F(y_0, x_0) \preceq gy_0$ then there exist $x, y \in X$ such that $gx = F(x,y)$ and $gy = F(y,x)$, that is, F and g have a coupled coincidence point.

Very recently, Harjani, López and Sadarangani [7] established coupled fixed point theorems for a mixed monotone operator satisfying contraction involving altering distance functions in a complete partially ordered metric space.
Denote by $\mathcal{F}$ the set of functions $\varphi : [0, +\infty) \to [0, +\infty)$ satisfying the following properties:
(a) φ is continuous and non-decreasing,
(b) $\varphi(t) = 0$ if and only if $t = 0$.

Theorem 1.3 *(Harjani, López and Sadarangani [7]). Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and d be a metric on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $F : X \times X \to X$ be a mapping having the mixed monotone property on X and satisfying*

$$\varphi(d(F(x,y), F(u,v)) \leq \varphi(\max\{d(x,u), d(y,v)\}) - \Phi(\max\{d(x,u), d(y,v)\})$$

for all $x, y, u, v \in X$ with $u \preceq x$ and $y \preceq v$, where $\varphi, \psi \in \mathcal{F}$. Suppose either F is continuous or X has the following properties:

(i) if a non-decreasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x_n \preceq x$ for all n,

(ii) if a non-increasing sequence $x_n \to x$, then $x \preceq x_n$ for all n.

If there exist $x_0, y_0 \in X$ such that $x_0 \preceq F(x_0, y_0)$ and $F(y_0, x_0) \preceq y_0$ then F has a coupled fixed point.

In this paper, we introduce the concept of mixed (G, S)-monotone mappings and prove coupled coincidence and coupled common fixed point theorems for such mappings satisfying a nonlinear contraction involving altering distance functions. Presented theorems extend, improve and generalize the results of Harjani, López and Sadarangani [7]. As applications of our obtained results, we study the existence and uniqueness of solution to periodic boundary value problem.

2 Main Results

Now, we introduce the concept of mixed (G, S)-monotone property.

Definition 2.1 *Let X be a non-empty set endowed with a partial order $\preceq$. Consider the mappings $F : X \times X \to X$ and $G, S : X \to X$. We say that F has the mixed (G, S)-monotone property on X if for all x, $y \in X$,*

$$\begin{aligned} x_1,\, x_2 \in X, \quad G(x_1) \preceq S(x_2) &\Rightarrow F(x_1, y) \preceq F(x_2, y),\\ x_1,\, x_2 \in X, \quad G(x_1) \succeq S(x_2) &\Rightarrow F(x_1, y) \succeq F(x_2, y),\\ y_1,\, y_2 \in X, \quad G(y_1) \preceq S(y_2) &\Rightarrow F(x, y_1) \succeq F(x, y_2),\\ y_1,\, y_2 \in X, \quad G(y_1) \succeq S(y_2) &\Rightarrow F(x, y_1) \preceq F(x, y_2). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1 *If we take $G = S$, then F has the mixed (G, S)-monotone property implies that F has the mixed G-monotone property.*

Now, we state and prove our first result.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and suppose that there exists a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $G, S : X \to X$ and $F : X \times X \to X$ be a mapping having the mixed (G, S)-monotone property on X. Suppose that*

$$\varphi(d(F(x, y), F(u, v))) \leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Su), d(Sy, Gv)\}) - \phi(\max\{d(Gx, Su), d(Sy, Gv)\}), \tag{1}$$

for all x, y, u, $v \in X$ with $G(x) \preceq S(u)$ or $G(x) \succeq S(u)$ and $S(y) \succeq G(v)$ or $S(y) \preceq G(v)$, where $\varphi, \phi \in \mathcal{F}$. Assume that $F(X \times X) \subseteq G(X) \cap S(X)$ and assume also that G, S and F satisfy the following hypotheses:

(I) F, G and S are continuous,

(II) F commutes respectively with G and S.

If there exist x_0, y_0, x_1 and y_1 such that

$$\begin{cases} G(x_0) \preceq S(x_1) \preceq F(x_0, y_0);\\ G(y_0) \succeq S(y_1) \succeq F(y_0, x_0), \end{cases}$$

then there exist x, $y \in X$ such that

$$G(x) = S(x) = F(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad G(y) = S(y) = F(y, x),$$

that is, G, S and F have a coupled coincidence point $(x, y) \in X \times X$.

Proof. Let x_0, y_0, x_1, $y_1 \in X$ such that

$$G(x_0) \preceq S(x_1) \preceq F(x_0, y_0) \quad \text{and} \quad G(y_0) \succeq S(y_1) \succeq F(y_0, x_0).$$

Since $F(X \times X) \subseteq G(X) \cap S(X)$, we can choose x_2, y_2, x_3, $y_3 \in X$ such that

$$\begin{cases} G(x_2) = F(x_0, y_0)\\ G(y_2) = F(y_0, x_0) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} S(x_3) = F(x_1, y_1)\\ S(y_3) = F(y_1, x_1) \end{cases}.$$

Continuing this process we can construct sequences $\{x_n\}$ and $\{y_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{cases} G(x_{2n+2}) = F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}) \\ G(y_{2n+2}) = F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}) \end{cases} ; \begin{cases} S(x_{2n+3}) = F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}) \\ S(y_{2n+3}) = F(y_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1}) \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0. \tag{2}$$

We shall show that for all $n \geq 0$,

$$G(x_{2n}) \preceq S(x_{2n+1}) \preceq G(x_{2n+2}) \tag{3}$$

and

$$G(y_{2n}) \geq S(y_{2n+1}) \geq G(y_{2n+2}). \tag{4}$$

As $G(x_0) \preceq S(x_1) \preceq F(x_0, y_0) = G(x_2)$ and $G(y_0) \succeq S(y_1) \succeq F(y_0, x_0) = G(y_2)$, our claim is satisfied for $n = 0$.
Suppose that (3) and (4) hold for some fixed $n \geq 0$. Since $G(x_{2n}) \preceq S(x_{2n+1}) \preceq G(x_{2n+2})$ and $G(y_{2n}) \succeq S(y_{2n+1}) \succeq G(y_{2n+2})$, and as F has the mixed (G, S)-monotone property, we have

$$G(x_{2n+2}) = F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}) \preceq F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n}) \preceq F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}) \preceq F(x_{2n+2}, y_{2n+1}) \preceq F(x_{2n+2}, y_{2n+2}),$$

then

$$G(x_{2n+2}) \preceq S(x_{2n+3}) \preceq G(x_{2n+4}).$$

On the other hand,

$$G(y_{2n+2}) = F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}) \succeq F(y_{2n+1}, x_{2n}) \succeq F(y_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1}) \succeq F(y_{2n+2}, x_{2n+1}) \succeq F(y_{2n+2}, x_{2n+2}),$$

then

$$G(y_{2n+2}) \succeq S(y_{2n+3}) \succeq G(y_{2n+4}).$$

Thus by induction, we proved that (3) and (4) hold for all $n \geq 0$.

We complete the proof in the following steps

Step 1: We will prove that

$$\lim_{n \to +\infty} d(F(x_n, y_n),\ F(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})) = \lim_{n \to +\infty} d(F(y_n, x_n),\ F(y_{n+1}, x_{n+1})) = 0. \tag{5}$$

From (3), (4) and (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\varphi(d(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}), F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}))) && (6) \\ &\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}), d(Gy_{2n}, Sy_{2n+1})\}) - \phi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}), d(Gy_{2n}, Sy_{2n+1})\}) && \\ &\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}), d(Gy_{2n}, Sy_{2n+1})\}). && (7) \end{aligned}$$

Since φ is a non-decreasing function, we get that

$$d(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}), F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1})) \leq \max\{d(Gx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}), d(Gy_{2n}, Sy_{2n+1})\}.$$

Therefore

$$d(Gx_{2n+2}, Sx_{2n+3}) \leq \max\{d(Gx_{2n}, Sx_{2n+1}), d(Gy_{2n}, Sy_{2n+1})\}. \tag{8}$$

Again, using (3), (4) and (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(d(F(y_{2n},x_{2n}),F(y_{2n+1},x_{2n+1})))\\&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1}),d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1})\})-\phi(\max\{d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1}),d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1})\})\\&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1}),d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1})\}).\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Since φ is non-decreasing, we have

$$d(F(y_{2n},x_{2n}),F(y_{2n+1},x_{2n+1}))\leq \max\{d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1}),d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}\}.$$

Therefore

$$d(Gy_{2n+2},Sy_{2n+3})\leq \max\{d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1}),d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1})\}. \tag{10}$$

Combining (8) and (10), we obtain

$$\max\{d(Gx_{2n+2},Sx_{2n+3}),d(Gy_{2n+2},Sy_{2n+3})\}\leq \max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\}.$$

Then $\Big\{\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\}\Big\}$ is a positive decreasing sequence. Hence there exists $r\geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\}=r.$$

Combining (7) and (9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{\varphi(d(Gx_{2n+2},Sx_{2n+3})),\varphi(d(Gy_{2n+2},Sy_{2n+3}))\}\\&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\})-\phi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

Since φ is non-decreasing, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n+2},Sx_{2n+3}),d(Gy_{2n+2},Sy_{2n+3})\})\\&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\})-\phi(\max\{d(Gx_{2n},Sx_{2n+1}),d(Gy_{2n},Sy_{2n+1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n\to+\infty$ in the above inequality, we get

$$\varphi(r)\leq\varphi(r)-\phi(r),$$

which implies that $\phi(r)=0$ and then, since ϕ is an altering distance function, $r=0$. Consequently

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\max\{d(F(x_{2n},y_{2n}),F(x_{2n+1},y_{2n+1})),d(F(y_{2n},x_{2n}),F(y_{2n+1},x_{2n+1}))\}=0. \tag{11}$$

By the same way, we obtain

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty}\max\{d(F(x_{2n+1},y_{2n+1}),F(x_{2n+2},y_{2n+2})),d(F(y_{2n+1},x_{2n+1}),F(y_{2n+2},x_{2n+2}))\}=0. \tag{12}$$

Finally, (11) and (12) give the desired result, that is, (5) holds.

Step 2: We will prove that $F(x_n, y_n)$ and $F(y_n, x_n)$ are Cauchy sequences.
From (5), it is sufficient to show that $F(x_{2n}, y_{2n})$ and $F(y_{2n}, x_{2n})$ are Cauchy sequences. We proceed by negation and suppose that at least one of the sequences $F(x_{2n}, y_{2n})$ or $F(y_{2n}, x_{2n})$ is not a Cauchy sequence.
This implies that $d(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}), F(x_{2m}, y_{2m})) \nrightarrow 0$ or $d(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}), F(y_{2m}, x_{2m})) \nrightarrow 0$ as $n, m \to +\infty$.
Consequently

$$\max\{d(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}), F(x_{2m}, y_{2m})), d(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}), F(y_{2m}, x_{2m}))\} \nrightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n, m \to +\infty.$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ for which we can find two subsequences of positive integers $\{m(i)\}$ and $\{n(i)\}$ such that $n(i)$ is the smallest index for which $n(i) > m(i) > i$,

$$\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} \geq \varepsilon. \quad (13)$$

This means that

$$\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)-2}, y_{2n(i)-2})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)-2}, x_{2n(i)-2}))\} < \varepsilon. \quad (14)$$

From (2.1), (14) and using the triangular inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon &\leq \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} \\
&\leq \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)-2}, y_{2n(i)-2})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)-2}, x_{2n(i)-2}))\} \\
&+ \max\{d(F(x_{2n(i)-2}, y_{2n(i)-2}), F(x_{2n(i)-1}, y_{2n(i)-1})), d(F(y_{2n(i)-2}, x_{2n(i)-2}), F(y_{2n(i)-1}, x_{2n(i)-1}))\} \\
&+ \max\{d(F(x_{2n(i)-1}, y_{2n(i)-1}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), (F(y_{2n(i)-1}, x_{2n(i)-1}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} \\
&< \varepsilon + \max\{d(F(x_{2n(i)-2}, y_{2n(i)-2}), F(y_{2n(i)-1}, x_{2n(i)-1})), d(F(y_{2n(i)-2}, x_{2n(i)-2}), F(y_{2n(i)-1}, x_{2n(i)-1}))\} \\
&+ \max\{(F(x_{2n(i)-1}, y_{2n(i)-1}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2n(i)-1}, x_{2n(i)-1}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $i \to +\infty$ in above inequality and using (5), we obtain that

$$\lim_{i \to +\infty} \max(d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))) = \varepsilon. \quad (15)$$

Also, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varepsilon &\leq \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} \\
&\leq \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2m(i)-1}, x_{2m(i)-1})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2m(i)-1}, x_{2m(i)-1}))\} \\
&+ \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-1}, y_{2m(i)-1}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)-1}, x_{2m(i)-1}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} \\
&\leq 2\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2m(i)-1}, y_{2m(i)-1})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2m(i)-1}, x_{2m(i)-1}))\} \\
&+ \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)}, y_{2m(i)}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)}, x_{2m(i)}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using (5), (15) and letting $i \to +\infty$ in the above inequality, we obtain

$$\lim_{i \to +\infty} \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-1}, y_{2m(i)-1}), F(x_{2n(i)}, y_{2n(i)})), d(F(y_{2m(i)-1}, x_{2m(i)-1}), F(y_{2n(i)}, x_{2n(i)}))\} = \varepsilon. \quad (16)$$

On other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)},y_{2m(i)}),F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)})),d(F(y_{2m(i)},x_{2m(i)}),F(y_{2n(i)},x_{2n(i)}))\}\\&\leq \max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)},y_{2m(i)}),F(x_{2n(i)+1},y_{2n(i)+1})),d(F(y_{2m(i)},x_{2m(i)}),F(y_{2n(i)+1},x_{2n(i)+1}))\}\\&+\max\{d(F(x_{2n(i)+1},y_{2n(i)+1}),F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)})),d(F(y_{2n(i)+1},x_{2n(i)+1}),F(y_{2n(i)},x_{2n(i)}))\}.\end{aligned}$$

Since φ is a continuous non-decreasing function, it follows from the above inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(\varepsilon)\leq\\&\limsup_{i\to+\infty}\varphi(\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)},y_{2m(i)}),F(x_{2n(i)+1},y_{2n(i)+1})),d(F(y_{2m(i)},x_{2m(i)}),F(y_{2n(i)+1},x_{2n(i)+1}))\}).\end{aligned}\tag{17}$$

Using the contractive condition, on one hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(d(F(x_{2m(i)},y_{2m(i)})),F(x_{2n(i)+1},y_{2n(i)+1}))\leq\varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2m(i)},Sx_{2n(i)+1}),d(Gy_{2m(i)},Sy_{2n(i)+1})\})\\&-\phi(\max\{d(Gx_{2m(i)},Sx_{2n(i)+1}),d(Gy_{2m(i)},Sy_{2n(i)+1})\})\leq\\&\varphi(\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1})\})\\&-\phi(\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(d(F(y_{2m(i)},x_{2m(i)})),F(y_{2n(i)+1},x_{2n(i)+1}))\leq\varphi(\max\{d(Gy_{2m(i)},Sy_{2n(i)+1}),d(Gx_{2m(i)},Sx_{2n(i)+1})\})\\&-\phi(\max\{d(Gy_{2m(i)},Sy_{2n(i)+1}),d(Gx_{2m(i)},Sx_{2n(i)+1})\})\leq\\&\varphi(\max\{d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}))\})\\&-\phi(\max\{d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{\varphi(d(F(x_{2m(i)},y_{2m(i)})),F(x_{2n(i)+1},y_{2n(i)+1})),\varphi(d(F(y_{2m(i)},x_{2m(i)})),F(y_{2n(i)+1},x_{2n(i)+1}))\}\\&\leq\varphi(\max\{d(Gx_{2m(i)},Sx_{2n(i)+1}),d(Gy_{2m(i)},Sy_{2n(i)+1})\})-\phi(\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),\\&\quad F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1})\}).\end{aligned}\tag{18}$$

We claim that

$$\begin{aligned}&\max\{d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2})),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}),d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2})),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1})\})\\&\to\varepsilon\ \text{ as }\ i\to+\infty.\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

In fact, using the triangular inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}))\\&\leq d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2m(i)-1},y_{2m(i)-1}))+d(F(x_{2m(i)-1},y_{2m(i)-1}),F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)}))\\&+d(F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1})).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $i\to+\infty$ in the above inequality and using (5) and (16), we obtain

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty}d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}))\leq\varepsilon.\tag{20}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&d(F(x_{2m(i)-1},y_{2m(i)-1}),F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)}))\\&\le d(F(x_{2m(i)-1},y_{2m(i)-1}),F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}))+d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}))\\&+d(F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}),F(x_{2n(i)},y_{2n(i)})).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $i \to +\infty$ in the above inequality and using (5) and (16), we obtain

$$\varepsilon \le \lim_{i\to+\infty} d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1})). \tag{21}$$

Combining (20) and (21), we get

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty} d(F(x_{2m(i)-2},y_{2m(i)-2}),F(x_{2n(i)-1},y_{2n(i)-1}))=\varepsilon.$$

By the same way, we obtain

$$\lim_{i\to+\infty} d(F(y_{2m(i)-2},x_{2m(i)-2}),F(y_{2n(i)-1},x_{2n(i)-1}))=\varepsilon.$$

Thus we proved (19). Finally, letting $i \to +\infty$ in (18), using (17), (19) and the continuity of φ and ϕ, we get $\varphi(\varepsilon) \le \varphi(\varepsilon) - \phi(\varepsilon)$, which implies that $\phi(\varepsilon) = 0$, that is, $\varepsilon = 0$, a contradiction. Thus $(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}))$ and $(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}))$ are Cauchy sequences in X, which gives us that $(F(x_n, y_n))$ and $(F(y_n, x_n))$ are also Cauchy sequences.

Step 3: Existence of a coupled coincidence point.
Since$(F(x_n, y_n))$ and $((F(y_n, x_n)))$ are Cauchy sequences in the complete metric space $(X,\, d)$, there exist $\alpha,\, \alpha' \in X$ such that:

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} F(x_n,y_n)=\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} F(y_n,x_n)=\alpha'.$$

Therefore, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} G(x_{2n+2}) = \alpha$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} G(y_{2n+2}) = \alpha'$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} S(x_{2n+3}) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} S(y_{2n+3}) = \alpha'$.
using the continuity and the commutativity of F and G, we have

$$\begin{aligned}G(G(x_{2n+2}))&=G(F(x_{2n},y_{2n}))\\&=F(Gx_{2n},Gy_{2n})\end{aligned} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{aligned}G(G(y_{2n+2}))&=G(F(y_{2n},x_{2n}))\\&=F(Gy_{2n},Gx_{2n}).\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$, we get $G(\alpha) = F(\alpha, \alpha')$ and $G(\alpha') = F(\alpha', \alpha)$.
Using also the continuity and the commutativity of F and S, by the same way, we obtain $S(\alpha) = F(\alpha, \alpha')$ and $S(\alpha') = F(\alpha', \alpha)$.
Therefore

$$G(\alpha)=F(\alpha,\alpha')=S(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad G(\alpha')=F(\alpha',\alpha)=S(\alpha').$$

Thus we proved that (α, α') is a coupled coincidence point of G, S and F. ■

In the next result, we prove that the previous theorem is still valid if we replace the continuity of F by some conditions.

Theorem 2.2 *If we replace the continuity hypothesis of F in Theorem 2.1 by the following conditions:*

(i) if (x_n) is a non-decreasing sequences with $x_n \to x$ then $x_n \leq x$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

(ii) if (y_n) is a non-increasing sequences with $y_n \to y$ then $y \leq y_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

(iii) $x, y \in X, \quad x \preceq y \Rightarrow Gx \preceq Sy$,

(iv) $x, y \in X, \quad x \succeq y \Rightarrow Gx \succeq Sy$.

Then G, S and F have a coupled coincidence point.

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 2.1, we have that $F(x_n, y_n)$ and $F(y_n, x_n)$ are Cauchy sequences in the complete metric space (X, d), there exist α, $\alpha' \in X$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} F(x_n, y_n) = \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to+\infty} F(y_n, x_n) = \alpha'.$$

Therefore $\lim_{n\to+\infty} F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} F(y_{2n}, x_{2n}) = \alpha'$. Hence $\lim_{n\to+\infty} G(x_{2n+2}) = \alpha$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} G(y_{2n+2}) = \alpha'$, $\lim_{n\to+\infty} S(x_{2n+3}) = \alpha$ and $\lim_{n\to+\infty} S(y_{2n+3}) = \alpha'$. Using the commutativity of F and G and of F and S and the contractive condition, it follows from conditions (iii)-(iv) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(d(G(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n})), S(F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1})))) \\
&= \varphi(d(F(Gx_{2n}, Gy_{2n}), F(Sx_{2n+1}, Sy_{2n+1}))) \\
&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1})), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1}))\}) && (22)\\
&- \phi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1})), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1}))\}). && (23)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(d(G(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n})), S(F(y_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1})))) \\
&= \varphi(d(F(Gy_{2n}, Gx_{2n}), F(Sy_{2n+1}, Sx_{2n+1}))) \\
&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1})), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1}))\}) && (24)\\
&- \phi(\max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1})), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1}))\}). && (25)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (22), (24) and the fact that $\max\{\varphi(a), \varphi(b)\} = \varphi(\max\{a, b\})$ for $a, b \in [0, +\infty)$, from (iii)-(iv), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(\max\{d(G(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n})), S(F(x_{2n+1}, y_{2n+1}))), d(G(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n})), S(F(y_{2n+1}, x_{2n+1})))\}) \\
&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1})), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1}))\}) \\
&- \phi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(Sx_{2n+1})), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(Sy_{2n+1}))\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$ in the last expression, using the continuity of G and S, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(\max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\}) \\
&\leq \varphi(\max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\}) - \phi(\max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\}).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\phi(\max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\}) = 0$ and, since ϕ is an altering distance function, then

$$\max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\} = 0.$$

Consequently

$$G(\alpha) = S(\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad G(\alpha') = S(\alpha'). \tag{26}$$

To finish the proof, we claim that $F(\alpha, \alpha') = G(\alpha) = S(\alpha)$ and $F(\alpha', \alpha) = G(\alpha') = S(\alpha')$. Indeed, using the contractive condition, it follows from (i)-(iv) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\varphi(d(F(Gx_{2n}, Gy_{2n}), F(\alpha, \alpha')))\\
&\le \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha)), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha'))\}) - \phi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha)), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha'))\})\\
&\le \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha)), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha'))\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that φ is non-decreasing, we get

$$d(F(Gx_{2n}, Gy_{2n}), F(\alpha, \alpha')) \le \max\{d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha)), d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha'))\}. \tag{27}$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\varphi(d(F(Gy_{2n}, Gx_{2n}), F(\alpha', \alpha))) &\le \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\})\\
&\quad -\phi(\max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\}\\
&\le \varphi(\max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\}).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that φ is non-decreasing, we see that

$$d(F(Gy_{2n}, Gx_{2n}), F(\alpha', \alpha)) \le \max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\}. \tag{28}$$

Combining (27) and (28), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\{d(F(Gx_{2n}, Gy_{2n}), F(\alpha, \alpha')), d(F(Gy_{2n}, Gx_{2n}), F(\alpha', \alpha)))\\
&\le \max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the commutativity of F and G, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max\{d(G(F(x_{2n}, y_{2n}))), F(\alpha, \alpha')), d(G(F(y_{2n}, x_{2n})), F(\alpha', \alpha))\}\\
&\le \max\{d(G(Gy_{2n}), S(\alpha')), d(G(Gx_{2n}), S(\alpha))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Letting $n \to +\infty$, using the continuity of G, we obtain

$$\max\{d(G(\alpha), F(\alpha, \alpha')), d(G(\alpha'), F(\alpha', \alpha))\} \le \max\{d(G(\alpha), S(\alpha)), d(G(\alpha'), S(\alpha'))\}.$$

Looking at (26), we deduce that

$$\max\{d(G(\alpha), F(\alpha, \alpha')), d(G(\alpha'), F(\alpha', \alpha))\} = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$d(G(\alpha), F(\alpha, \alpha')) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad d(G(\alpha'), F(\alpha', \alpha)) = 0.$$

Consequently

$$G(\alpha) = F(\alpha, \alpha') \quad \text{and} \quad G(\alpha') = F(\alpha', \alpha). \tag{29}$$

By the same way, we get

$$S(\alpha) = F(\alpha, \alpha') \quad \text{and} \quad S(\alpha') = F(\alpha', \alpha). \tag{30}$$

Finally, combining (26), (29) and (30), we deduce that (α, α') is a coupled coincidence point of F, G and S. $\blacksquare$

Now, we give a sufficient condition for the existence and the uniqueness of the coupled common fixed point. Notice that if $(X, \preceq)$ is a partially ordered set, we endow $X \times X$ with the following partial order relation:

$$\text{for } \ (x, y),\, (u, v) \in X \times X, \quad (x, y) \preceq (u, v) \Leftrightarrow x \preceq u \ \text{ and } \ y \succeq v.$$

Theorem 2.3 *In addition to the hypotheses of Theorem 2.1 (resp. Theorem 2.2), suppose that for every* $(x,\, y)$, $(x^*,\, y^*) \in X \times X$ *there exists a* $(u,\, v) \in X \times X$ *such that* $(F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$ *is comparable to* $(F(x,\, y),\, F(y,\, x))$ *and* $(F(x^*,\, y^*),\, F(y^*,\, x^*))$*. Then* F*,* G *and* S *have a unique coupled common fixed point, that is, there exist a unique* $(x,\, y) \in X \times X$ *such that*

$$x = G(x) = F(x,\, y) = S(x) \quad \textit{and} \quad y = G(y) = F(y,\, x) = S(y).$$

Proof. We know, from Theorem 2.1 (resp. Theorem 2.2), that exists a coupled coincidence point. We suppose that exist $(x,\, y)$ and $(x^*,\, y^*)$ two coupled coincidence points, that is, $G(x) = F(x,\, y) = S(x)$, $G(y) = F(y,\, x) = S(y)$, $G(x^*) = F(x^*,\, y^*) = S(x^*)$ and $G(y^*) = F(y^*,\, x^*) = S(y^*)$.
We claim that

$$G(x) = G(x^*) = S(x^*) = S(x) \quad \text{and} \quad G(y) = G(y^*) = S(y^*) = S(y). \tag{31}$$

If $(F(x,\, y),\, F(y,\, x))$ is comparable to $(F(x^*,\, y^*),\, F(y^*,\, x^*))$, it is easy to reach the result, then we suppose the general case.
By assumption there is $(u,\, v) \in X \times X$ such that $(F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$ is comparable to $(F(x,\, y)\, F(y,\, x))$ and $(F(x^*,\, y^*)\, F(y^*,\, x^*))$. We distinguish two cases:
First case: We assume that
$(F(x,\, y),\, F(y,\, x)) \preceq (F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$ and $(F(x^*,\, y^*),\, F(y^*,\, x^*)) \preceq (F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$.
Put $u_0 = u$ and $v_0 = v$ and we choose u_1 and v_1 such that $G(u_0) \preceq S(u_1) \preceq F(u_0,\, v_0)$, $G(v_0) \succeq S(v_1) \succeq F(v_0,\, u_0)$.
Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can construct sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{cases} G(u_{2n+2}) = F(u_{2n}, v_{2n}) \\ G(v_{2n+2}) = F(v_{2n}, u_{2n}) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} S(u_{2n+3}) = F(u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1}) \\ S(v_{2n+3}) = F(v_{2n+1}, u_{2n+1}) \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

Looking at the proof of Theorem 2.1, precisely at (3), we see that $\{G(u_{2n})\}$ is a non-decreasing sequence, $G(u_{2n}) \leq S(u_{2n+1})$, and $\{G(v_{2n})\}$ is a non-increasing sequence, $G(v_{2n}) \succeq S(v_{2n+1})$.
Therefore, we have

$$\begin{gathered} G(x) = F(x,y) \leq F(u_0,v_0) = G(u_2) \preceq G(u_{2n}) \preceq S(u_{2n+1}) \\ \text{and} \\ G(y) = F(y,x) \succeq F(v_0,u_0) = G(v_2) \succeq G(v_{2n}) \succeq S(v_{2n+1}). \end{gathered} \tag{32}$$

Similarly, we have

$$G(x^*) = F(x^*, y^*) \preceq F(u_0, v_0) = G(u_2) \preceq G(u_{2n}) \preceq S(u_{2n+1})$$
$$\text{and} \tag{33}$$
$$G(y^*) = F(y^*, x^*) \succeq F(v_0, u_0) = G(v_2) \succeq G(v_{2n}) \succeq S(v_{2n+1}).$$

Using (32) and the contractive condition, we write

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(d(F(x,y), F(u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1}))) &\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}) \\ &\quad -\phi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\})\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(d(F(y,x), F(v_{2n+1}, u_{2n+1}))) &\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1}), d(Gx, Su_{2n+1})\}) \\ &\quad -\phi(\max\{d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1}), d(Gx, Su_{2n+1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}&\varphi(\max\{d(F(x,y), F(u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1})), d(F(y,x), F(v_{2n+1}, u_{2n+1}))\}) \\ &\qquad \leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}) \\ &\qquad -\phi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}).\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(\max(d(G(x), Su_{2n+3}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+3}))) &\leq \varphi(\max(d(G(x), Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1}))) \\ &\quad -\phi(\max(d(G(x), Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1}))).\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

We see that

$$\varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+3}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+3})\}) \leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}).$$

Using the non-decreasing property of φ, we get

$$\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+3}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+3})\} \leq \max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}.$$

This implies that $\max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\}$ is a non-increasing sequence. Hence, there exists $r \geq 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\} = r.$$

Passing to limit in (34) as $n \to +\infty$, we obtain

$$\varphi(r) \leq \varphi(r) - \phi(r),$$

which implies that $\phi(r) = 0$ and then, since ϕ is an altering distance function, $r = 0$. We deduce that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \max\{d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1})\} = 0. \tag{35}$$

Similarly, one can prove that

$$\lim_{n\to+\infty} \max\{d(Gx^*, Su_{2n+1}), d(Gy^*, Sv_{2n+1})\} = 0. \tag{36}$$

By the triangle inequality, (35) and (36),

$$d(Gx,\, Gx^*) \leq d(Gx, Su_{2n+1}) + d(G(x^*), Su_{2n+1}) \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty, \tag{37}$$

$$d(Gy,\, Gy^*) \leq d(Gy, Sv_{2n+1}) + d(G(y^*), Sv_{2n+1}) \to 0 \quad \text{as } n \to +\infty. \tag{38}$$

Hence

$$G(x) = G(x^*) \text{ and } G(y) = G(y^*). \tag{39}$$

This prove the claim (31) in this case.
Second case: We assume that $(F(x,\, y),\, F(y,\, x)) \succeq (F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$ and $(F(x^*,\, y^*),\, F(y^*,\, x^*)) \succeq (F(u,\, v),\, F(v,\, u))$.
Put $u_0 = u$ and $v_0 = v$ and we choose u_1 and v_1 such that $G(u_0) \succeq S(u_1) \succeq F(u_0,\, v_0)$, $G(v_0) \preceq S(v_1) \preceq F(v_0,\, u_0)$.
Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.1, we can construct sequences $\{u_n\}$ and $\{v_n\}$ in X such that

$$\begin{cases} G(u_{2n+2}) = F(u_{2n}, v_{2n}) \\ G(v_{2n+2}) = F(v_{2n}, u_{2n}) \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{cases} S(u_{2n+3}) = F(u_{2n+1}, v_{2n+1}) \\ S(v_{2n+3}) = F(v_{2n+1}, u_{2n+1}) \end{cases} \quad \text{for all } n \geq 0.$$

Looking at the proof of Theorem 2.1, precisely at (3), we see that $\{G(u_{2n})\}$ is a non-increasing sequence, $G(u_{2n}) \succeq S(u_{2n+1})$, and $\{G(v_{2n})\}$ is a non-decreasing sequence, $G(v_{2n}) \preceq S(v_{2n+1})$.
Therefore, we have

$$G(x) = F(x, y) \succeq F(u_0, v_0) = G(u_2) \succeq G(u_{2n}) \succeq S(u_{2n+1})$$

and

$$G(y) = F(y, x) \preceq F(v_0, u_0) = G(v_2) \preceq G(v_{2n}) \preceq S(v_{2n+1}).$$

Similarly, we have

$$G(x^*) = F(x^*, y^*) \succeq F(u_0, v_0) = G(u_2) \succeq G(u_{2n}) \succeq S(u_{2n+1})$$

and

$$G(y^*) = F(y^*, x^*) \preceq F(v_0, u_0) = G(v_2) \preceq G(v_{2n}) \preceq S(v_{2n+1}).$$

From this, we complete the proof identically as in the first case and we obtain the claim (31) in this case. Since $G(x) = F(x, y) = S(x)$ and $G(y) = F(y, x) = S(y)$, by the commutativity of F, G and F, S, we have

$$\begin{cases} G(G(x)) = G(F(x, y)) = F(Gx, Gy) \\ G(G(y)) = G(F(y, x)) = F(Gy, Gx) \end{cases} \text{and} \begin{cases} S(S(x)) = S(F(x, y)) = F(S(x), S(y)) \\ S(S(y)) = S(F(y, x)) = F(S(y), S(x)). \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

Set $G(x) = a = S(x)$, $G(y) = b = S(y)$. Then from (40),

$$G(a) = F(a, b) = S(a) \text{ and } G(b) = F(b, a) = S(b). \tag{41}$$

Thus (a, b) is a coupled coincidence point. Then from (31) with $x^* = a$ and $y^* = b$ it follows that $G(a) = G(x) = S(a)$ and $G(b) = G(y) = S(b)$. Therefore

$$G(a) = a = S(a) \quad \text{and} \quad G(b) = b = S(b). \tag{42}$$

We deduce that (a, b) is a coupled common fixed point. To prove the uniqueness, assume that (c, d) is another coupled common fixed point. Then by (31) and (42) we have $c = G(c) = G(a) = a$ and $d = G(d) = G(b) = b$. ■

Remark 2
Taking $G = S = I_X$ (the identity mapping of X) in Theorem 2.1, we obtain [7, Theorem 2].
Taking $G = S = I_X$ in Theorem 2.2, we obtain [7, Theorem 3].

Taking $S = G$ in Theorem 2.3, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 2.1 *Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a partially ordered set and suppose that there exists a metric d on X such that (X, d) is a complete metric space. Let $G : X \to X$ be two mappings and $F : X \times X \to X$ be a mapping with the mixed G-monotone property and satisfying*

$$\varphi(d(F(x, y), F(u, v))) \leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx, Gu), d(Gy, Gv)\}) - \phi(\max\{Gx, Gu), d(Gy, Gv)\}),$$

for all x, y, u, $v \in X$ with $G(x) \preceq G(u)$ or $G(x) \succeq G(u)$ and $G(y) \succeq G(v)$ or $G(y) \preceq G(v)$, where φ and ϕ are altering distance functions. Assume that $F(X \times X) \subseteq G(X)$ and assume also the following hypotheses:

1. *G is continuous,*
2. *F is continuous or G is non-decreasing mapping and X satisfies the following properties:*
   - *if (x_n) is a non-decreasing sequences with $x_n \to x$ then $x_n \preceq x$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*
   - *if (y_n) is a non-increasing sequences with $y_n \to y$ then $y \preceq y_n$ for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$;*
3. *for every (x, y), $(x^*, y^*) \in X \times X$ there exists a $(u, v) \in X \times X$ such that $(F(u, v), F(v, u))$ is comparable to $(F(x, y), F(y, x))$ and $(F(x^*, y^*), F(y^*, x^*))$,*
4. *F commutes with G.*

If there exist x_0, $y_0 \in X$ such that

$$\begin{cases} G(x_0) \preceq F(x_0, y_0) \\ G(y_0)) \succeq F(y_0, x_0) \end{cases}$$

then there exists a unique $(x, y) \in X \times X$ such that

$$x = G(x) = F(x, y) \quad \text{and} \quad y = G(y) = F(y, x),$$

that is, G and F have a unique coupled common fixed point.

3 Applications to periodic boundary value problems

In this section, we study the existence and uniqueness of solution to a periodic boundary value problem, as an application to the fixed point theorem given by Corollary 2.1.
Let $C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$ be the set of all continuous functions $u : [0,T] \to \mathbb{R}$ and consider a mapping $G : C([0,T],\mathbb{R}) \to C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$.
Consider the periodic boundary value problem

$$u' = f(t,u) + h(t,u), \quad t \in (0,T) \tag{43}$$

$$u(0) = u(T), \tag{44}$$

where f, h are two continuous functions satisfying the following conditions:
There exist positive constants λ_1, λ_2, μ_1 and μ_2, such that for all u, $v \in (C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$, $Gv(t) \le Gu(t)$,

$$0 \le (f(t,u(t)) + \lambda_1 u(t)) - (f(t,v(t)) + \lambda_1 v(t)) \le \mu_1 \ln[(Gu(t) - Gv(t))^2 + 1] \tag{45}$$

$$-\mu_2 \ln[(Gu(t) - Gv(t))^2 + 1] \le (h(t,u(t)) + \lambda_2 u(t)) - (h(t,v(t)) + \lambda_2 v(t)) \le 0 \tag{46}$$

with

$$\frac{2\max\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2} < 1. \tag{47}$$

We firstly study the existence of a solution of the following periodic system:

$$\begin{aligned} u' + \lambda_1 u - \lambda_2 v &= f(t,u) + h(t,v) + \lambda_1 u - \lambda_2 v \\ v' + \lambda_1 v - \lambda_2 u &= f(t,v) + h(t,u) + \lambda_1 v - \lambda_2 u, \end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

with the periodicity condition

$$u(0) = u(T) \quad \text{and} \quad v(0) = v(T). \tag{49}$$

This problem is equivalent to the integral equations:

$$u(t) = \int_0^T k_1(t,s)[f(s,u) + h(s,v) + \lambda_1 u - \lambda_2 v] + \int_0^T k_2(t,s)[f(s,v) + h(s,u) + \lambda_1 v - \lambda_2 u]ds$$

$$v(t) = \int_0^T k_1(t,s)[f(s,v) + h(s,u) + \lambda_1 v - \lambda_2 u] + \int_0^T k_2(t,s)[f(s,u) + h(s,v) + \lambda_1 u - \lambda_2 v]ds$$

where

$$k_1(t,s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\left[\dfrac{e^{\sigma_1(t-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}} + \dfrac{e^{\sigma_2(t-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_2 T}}\right] & 0 \le s < t \le T \\ \frac{1}{2}\left[\dfrac{e^{\sigma_1(t+T-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}} + \dfrac{e^{\sigma_2(t+T-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_2 T}}\right] & 0 \le t < s \le T \end{cases}$$

$$k_2(t,s) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}\left[\dfrac{e^{\sigma_2(t-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_2 T}} + \dfrac{e^{\sigma_1(t-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}}\right] & 0 \le s < t \le T \\ \frac{1}{2}\left[\dfrac{e^{\sigma_2(t+T-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_2 T}} + \dfrac{e^{\sigma_1(t+T-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}}\right] & 0 \le t < s \le T. \end{cases}$$

Here, $\sigma_1 = -(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$ and $\sigma_2 = (\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)$.
From [3, Lemma 3.2], we have

$$k_1(t,s) \geq 0,\ \ 0 \leq t,s \leq T \quad \text{and} \quad k_2(t,s) \leq 0,\ \ 0 \leq t,s \leq T. \tag{50}$$

We assume that there exist $\alpha, \beta \in C([0,T])$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\alpha(t)) \leq & \int_0^1 k_1(t,s)(f(s,\alpha(s)) + h(s,\beta(s)) + \lambda_1\alpha(s) - \lambda_2\beta(s))ds \\ & + \int_0^1 k_2(t,s)(f(s,\beta(s)) + h(s,\alpha(s)) + \lambda_1\beta(s) - \lambda_2\alpha(s))ds \end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} G(\beta(t)) \geq & \int_0^1 k_1(t,s)(f(s,\beta(s)) + h(s,\alpha(s)) + \lambda_1\beta(s) - \lambda_2\alpha(s))ds \\ & + \int_0^1 k_2(t,s)(f(s,\alpha(s)) + h(s,\beta(s)) + \lambda_1\alpha(s) - \lambda_2\beta(s))ds. \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

We endow $X = C([0,T],\mathbb{R})$ with the metric $d(u,\, v) = \max_{t\in[0,T]} |u(t) - v(t)|$ for $u,\, v \in X$. This space can be equipped with a partial order given by

$$x,\, y \in C([0,T]), \quad x \preceq y \Leftrightarrow x(t) \leq y(t), \quad \text{for any } t \in [0,T].$$

In $X \times X$ we define the following partial order

$$(x,\, y),\ (u,\, v) \in X \times X, \quad (x,\, y) \preceq (u,\, v) \Leftrightarrow x \preceq u \quad \text{ and } \quad y \succeq v.$$

Since for any $x,\, y \in X$ we have that $\max(x,y)$ and $\min(x,y) \in X$, assumption 3 of Corollary 2.1 is satisfied for $(X, \preceq)$. Moreover in [10] it is proved that $(X, \preceq)$ satisfies assumption 2 of Corollary 2.1.

Now, we shall prove the following result.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose that $G : X \to X$ is a non-decreasing continuous mapping. Suppose also that (45)-(47) and (51)-(52) hold. Then (48)-(49) has a unique solution. Therefore (43)-(44) has also a unique solution.*

Proof. We introduce the operator $F : X \times X \to X$ defined by

$$\begin{aligned} F(u,v)(t) \quad = \quad & \int_0^T k_1(t,s)[f(s,u) + h(s,v) + \lambda_1 u - \lambda_2 v]\ ds \\ & + \int_0^T k_2(t,s)[f(s,v) + h(s,u) + \lambda_1 v - \lambda_2 u]ds \end{aligned}$$

for all $u, v \in X$ and $t \in [0,T]$.

We claim that F has the mixed G-monotone property.
In fact, for $Gx_1 \leq Gx_2$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x_1, y)(t) - F(x_2, y)(t) &= \int_0^T k_1(t,s)(f(s, x_1(s)) - f(s, x_2) + \lambda_1(x_1(s) - x_2(s))ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T k_2(t,s)(h(s, x_1(s)) - h(s, x_2) - \lambda_2(x_1 - x_2))ds. \end{aligned}$$

From (45), (46) and (50), for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$F(x_1, y)(t) - F(x_2, y)(t) \leq 0.$$

This implies that

$$F(x_1, y) \preceq F(x_2, y).$$

Also, for $Gy_1 \preceq Gy_2$ and $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(x, y_1)(t) - F(x, y_1)(t) &= \int_0^T k_1(t,s)(h(s, y_1(s)) - h(s, y_2) - \lambda_2(y_1(s) - y_2(s))ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^T k_2(t,s)(f(s, y_1(s)) - f(s, y_2) + \lambda_1(y_1 - y_2))ds. \end{aligned}$$

Looking at (45), (46) and (50), for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$F(x, y_1)(t) - F(x, y_2)(t) \geq 0,$$

that is,

$$F(x, y_1) \geq F(x, y_2).$$

Thus, we proved that F has the mixed G-monotone property.

For $G(x) \preceq G(u)$ and $G(y) \succeq G(v)$, we have $F(x, y) \succeq F(u, v)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &d(F(x,y), F(u,v)) = \max_{t\in[0,T]} |F(x,y)(t) - F(u,v)(t)| \\ &= \max_{t\in[0,T]} (F(x,y)(t) - F(u,v)(t)) \\ &= \max_{t\in[0,T]} \int_0^T k_1(t,s)[(f(s,x(s)) - f(s,u(s)) + \lambda_1(x-u)) - (h(s,v(s)) - h(s,y(s)) - \lambda_2(y-v))]ds \\ &- \int_0^T k_2(t,s)[(f(s,v(s)) - f(s,y(s)) + \lambda_1(v-y)) - (h(s,u(s)) - h(s,x(s)) - \lambda_2(u-x))]ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using (45) and (46) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &d(F(x,y), F(u,v)) \\ &\leq \max_{t\in[0,T]} \int_0^T k_1(t,s)\Big(\mu_1 \ln[(Gx(s) - Gu(s))^2 + 1] + \mu_2 \ln[(Gy(s) - Gv(s))^2 + 1]\Big)ds \\ &+ \int_0^T (-k_2(t,s))\Big(\mu_1 \ln[(Gv(s) - Gy(s))^2 + 1] + \mu_2 \ln[(Gx(s) - Gu(s))^2 + 1]\Big)ds \\ &\leq \max(\mu_1, \mu_2) \max_{t\in[0,T]} \int_0^T (k_1(t,s) - k_2(t,s)) \ln[(Gx(s) - Gu(s))^2 + 1]ds \\ &+ \int_0^T (k_1(t,s) - k_2(t,s)) \ln[(Gy(s) - Gv(s))^2 + 1]ds. \end{aligned}$$

An easy computation yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
&d(F(x,y),F(u,v))\\
&\leq \Big(\max_{t\in[0,T]}\int_0^T (k_1(t,s)-k_2(t,s))ds\Big)\max(\mu_1,\mu_2)\left(\ln[(d(Gx,Gu))^2+1]+\ln[(d(Gy,Gv))^2+1]\right)\\
&\leq 2\Big(\max_{t\in[0,T]}\int_0^T (k_1(t,s)-k_2(t,s))ds\Big)\max(\mu_1,\mu_2)\ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1]\\
&\leq 2\max(\mu_1,\mu_2)\max_{t\in[0,T]}\left|\int_0^t \frac{e^{\sigma_1(t-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}}ds+\int_t^T \frac{e^{\sigma_1(t+T-s)}}{1-e^{\sigma_1 T}}ds\right|\ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1].
\end{aligned}
$$

After integrating, we get

$$d(F(x,y),F(u,v))\leq \frac{2\max(\mu_1,\mu_2)}{\lambda_1+\lambda_2}\ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1].$$

From (47), we obtain

$$d(F(x,y),F(u,v))\leq \ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1]$$

which implies that

$$(d(F(x,y),F(u,v)))^2\leq (\ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1])^2.$$

Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(d(F(x,y),F(u,v)))^2\leq (\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2\\
&-\left[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2-(\ln[(\max(d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)))^2+1])^2\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

Set $\varphi(t)=t^2$ and $\phi(t)=t^2-\ln(t^2+1)$. Clearly φ and ϕ are altering distance functions and from the above inequality, we obtain

$$\varphi(d(F(x,y),F(u,v)))\leq \varphi(\max\{d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)\})-\phi((\max\{d(Gx,Gu),d(Gy,Gv)\}))$$

for all $x,y,u,v\in X$ such that $G(x)\preceq G(u)$ and $G(y)\succeq G(v)$.
Now, let $\alpha,\beta\in X$ be the functions given by (51) and (52).Then, we have

$$G(\alpha)\preceq F(\alpha,\beta)\quad\text{ and }\quad F(\beta,\alpha)\preceq G(\beta).$$

Thus, we proved that all the required hypotheses of Corollary 2.1 are satisfied. Hence, G and F have a unique coupled fixed point $(u,v)\in X\times X$, that is, (u,v) is the unique solution of (48)-(49). ■

References

[1] R.P. Agarwal, M. A. El-Gebeily, D. O'regan, Generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces, Appl. Anal. 87 (1)(2008) 109-116.

[2] I. Altun, H. Simsek, Some fixed point theorems on ordered metric spaces and application, Fixed Point Theory Appl. 2010(2010) Article ID 621492, 17 pages.

[3] T.G. Bhaskar, V. Lakshmikantham, Fixed point theorems in partially ordered metric spaces and applications, Nonlinear Anal.65(2006) 1379-1393.

[4] B.S. Choudhury, A. Kundu, A coupled coincidence point result in partially ordered metric spaces for compatible mappings, Nonlinear Anal., (2010), doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.06.025.

[5] J. Harjani, K. Sadarangani, Fixed point theorems for weakly contractive mappings in partially ordered sets, Nonlinear Anal. 71 (7-8) (2008) 3403-3410.

[6] J. Harjani, K. Sadarangani, Generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces and applications to ordinary differential equations, Nonlinear Anal. 72(3-4)(2010) 1188-1197.

[7] J. Harjani, B. López, K. Sadarangani, Fixed point theorems for mixed monotone operators and applications to integral equations, Nonlinear Anal. (2010) doi:10.1016/J.na.2010.10.047.

[8] V. Lakshmikantham, Lj. Ćirić, Coupled fixed point theorems for nonlinear contractions in partially ordered metric spaces, Nonlinear Analysis 70 (2009) 4341-4349.

[9] N.V. Luong, N. X. Thuan, Coupled fixed points in partially ordered metric spaces and application, Nonlinear Analysis, 74(3)(2011) 983-992

[10] J.J. Nieto, R. Rodŕiguez-López, Contractive mapping theorems in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations, Order 22 (2005) 223-239.

[11] J.J. Nieto, R. Rodŕiguez-López, Existence and uniqueness of fixed point in partially ordered sets and applications to ordinary differential equations, Acta Math. Sin. 23 (12)(2007) 2205-2212.

[12] J.J. Nieto, R.L. Pouso, R. Rodŕiguez-López, Fixed point theorems in partially ordered sets, Proc. Amer. Soc. 132 (8) (2007) 2505-2517.

[13] H.K. Nashine, B. Samet, Fixed point results for mappings satisfying (ψ, ϕ)-weakly contractive condition in partially ordered metric spaces, Nonlinear Analysis (2010), doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.11.024.

[14] A.C.M. Ran, M.C.B. Reurings, A fixed point theorem in partially ordered sets and some applications to metrix equations, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 132 (5)(2004)1435-1443.

[15] M-D. Rus, Fixed point theorems for generalized contractions in partially ordered metric spaces with semi-monotone metric, Nonlinear Analysis (2010) doi:10.1016/j.na.2010.10.053.

[16] B. Samet, Coupled fixed point theorems for a generalized Meir-Keeler contraction in partially ordered metric spaces, Nonlinear Anal. 72 (2010) 4508-4517.

[17] W. Shatanawi, Partially ordered cone metric spaces and coupled fixed point results, Computers and Mathematics with Applications 60 (2010) 2508-2515.

Habib Yazidi
UNIVERSITÉ DE TUNIS, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TUNIS COLLEGE OF SCIENCES AND TECHNIQUES, 5 AVENUE TAHA HUSSEIN, BP, 59, BAB MANARA, TUNIS.
E-mail address: habib.yazidi@gmail.com